



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,306	03/29/2004	Masumi Kubo	1035-503	9652
23117 7590 11/13/2008 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203				
EXAMINER				
ZUBAJLO, JENNIFER L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/13/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/811,306

Applicant(s)

KUBO, MASUMI

Examiner

JENNIFER ZUBAJLO

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hiroshi Okumura (Pub. No.: US 2002/0191128).

As to claim 1, Okumura teaches a liquid crystal display device comprising: a liquid crystal panel comprising a first substrate, a second substrate and a liquid crystal layer, said liquid crystal layer comprising liquid crystal having negative dielectric anisotropy provided between the first and second substrates (see [0120] and claims 1 & 5); and a drive voltage setting section which sets a drive voltage to drive the liquid crystal panel and supplies the set drive voltage to the liquid crystal panel, wherein: the drive voltage setting section sets a drive voltage in accordance with viewing angle characteristics of the liquid crystal panel, thereby controlling viewing angle characteristics, and switches between wide viewing angle characteristics and narrow viewing angle characteristics (see [0103] and [0174]).

As to claim 14, Okumura teaches an electronic device (see [0004]) including a liquid crystal display device, the liquid crystal display device comprising: a liquid crystal panel comprising a first substrate, a second substrate and a liquid crystal layer, said liquid crystal layer comprising liquid crystal having negative dielectric anisotropy provided between the first and second substrates (see [0120] and claims 1 & 5), a drive voltage setting section which sets a drive voltage to drive the liquid crystal panel and supplies the set drive voltage to the liquid crystal panel, wherein: the drive voltage setting section sets a drive voltage in accordance with viewing angle characteristics of the liquid crystal panel, thereby controlling viewing angle characteristics, and switches between wide viewing angle characteristics and narrow viewing angle characteristics (see [0103] and [0174]).

As to claim 15, Okumura teaches an electronic device capable of performing at least two types of functions among the following functions: electronic messaging, camera shooting, Internet access, and television reception (see [0004]), and including a liquid crystal display device displaying a state of performing the function during performance of each of the functions, the liquid crystal display device comprising: a liquid crystal panel comprising a first substrate, a second substrate and a liquid crystal layer, said liquid crystal layer comprising liquid crystal having negative dielectric anisotropy provided between the first and second substrates (see [0120] and claims 1 & 5); a drive voltage setting section which sets a drive voltage to drive the liquid crystal panel and supplies the set drive voltage to the liquid crystal panel, wherein: the drive

voltage setting section sets a drive voltage corresponding to the function to be performed, thereby controlling viewing angle characteristics, and switches between wide viewing angle characteristics and narrow viewing angle characteristics (see [0103] and [0174]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiroshi Okumura (Pub. No.: US 2002/0191128) in view of Donald E. Mosier (Patent No.: US 5,489,918).

As to claim 2, Okumura teaches the liquid crystal display device according to claim 1 (see above rejection).

Okumura does not directly teach the drive voltage in relation to the grayscale.

Mosier teaches a drive voltage for a lower end of grayscale to be supplied to the liquid crystal panel with narrow viewing angle characteristics so as to be higher than a drive voltage for a lower end of grayscale to be supplied to the liquid crystal panel with wide viewing angle characteristics (see column 25 lines 7-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of the grayscale drive relation taught by Mosier into the liquid crystal display device taught by Okumura in order to provide a method and apparatus for generating gray level voltages which can compensate for a variety of different factors associated with the performance of the LCD.

As to claim 3, Okumura teaches the liquid crystal display device according to claim 1 (see above rejection).

Okumura does not directly teach grayscale degradation.

Mosier teaches a drive voltage for a higher end of grayscale to be supplied to the liquid crystal panel, so as to be a voltage on which grayscale degradation occurs at the oblique viewing angle (see column 6 lines 66-67, column 7 lines 1-7, and column 25 lines 7-20, 44-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of the grayscale degradation taught by Mosier into the liquid crystal display device taught by Okumura in order to provide a method and apparatus for generating gray level voltages which can compensate for a variety of different factors associated with the performance of the LCD.

As to claim 4, Okumura teaches the liquid crystal display device according to claim 1 (see above rejection).

Okumura does not directly teach the drive voltage in relation to the grayscale.

Mosier teaches the drive voltage setting section, when transmission intensity of the liquid crystal panel has such a magnitude that grayscale inversions occur on a higher end of grayscale at the oblique viewing angle, sets a drive voltage for a higher end of grayscale to be supplied to the liquid crystal panel with wide viewing angle characteristics to be a voltage on which no grayscale degradation occurs at the oblique viewing angle (see column 6 lines 66-67, column 7 lines 1-7, column 25 lines 7-20, 44-60, 66-67 and column 26 lines 1-5, 17-21, 58-63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of the grayscale drive relation taught by Mosier into the liquid crystal display device taught by Okumura in order to provide a method and apparatus for generating gray level voltages which can compensate for a variety of different factors associated with the performance of the LCD.

As to claim 5, the combination of Okumura and Mosier teach the liquid crystal display device according to claim 4 (see above rejection). Mosier also teaches the drive voltage setting section does not change a drive voltage for a lower end of grayscale to be supplied to the liquid crystal panel (see column 26 lines 25-34).

As to claim 6, Okumura teaches the liquid crystal display device according to claim 1 (see above rejection).

Okumura does not directly teach drive voltage with reference to a lookup table, set in advance, representing a relationship between an input grayscale level and a drive voltage.

Mosier teaches the drive voltage setting section sets a drive voltage with reference to a lookup table (in this case a graph/wave form), set in advance, representing a relationship between an input grayscale level and a drive voltage (see column 14 lines 16-29, 44-57, column 15 lines 16-19, 32-34, 39-41, 52-65, column 16 lines 37-45, and column 26 lines 37-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of drive voltage with reference to a graph, set in advance, representing a relationship between an input grayscale level and a drive voltage taught by Mosier into the liquid crystal display device taught by Okumura in order to provide a method and apparatus for generating gray level voltages which can compensate for a variety of different factors associated with the performance of the LCD.

As to claim 7, the combination of Okumura and Mosier teach the liquid crystal display device according to claim 6 (see above rejection). Mosier also teaches the lookup table (wave form/graph) is set for each type of viewing angle characteristics, and the drive voltage setting section selects a lookup table corresponding to viewing angle characteristics (see column 7 lines 8-39 and column 14 lines 44-57).

As to claim 8, Okumura teaches the liquid crystal display device according to claim 1 (see above rejection).

Okumura does not directly teach a drive voltage in accordance with a program, set in advance, representing a relationship between an input grayscale level and a drive voltage.

Mosier teaches a drive voltage in accordance with a program (set of instructions), set in advance, for determining an output grayscale level with respect to an input grayscale level (see column 14 lines 16-29, column 15 lines 10-15, 32-42, column 16 lines 37-45, column 17 lines 50-57, 66-67, and column 18 lines 1-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of a drive voltage in accordance with a program, set in advance, representing a relationship between an input grayscale level and a drive voltage taught by Mosier into the liquid crystal display device taught by Okumura in order to provide a method and apparatus for generating gray level voltages which can compensate for a variety of different factors associated with the performance of the LCD.

As to claim 9, the combination of Okumura and Mosier teach the liquid crystal display device according to claim 8 (see above rejection). Mosier also teaches the program set for each type of viewing angle characteristic, and the drive voltage setting section selects and executes a program corresponding to viewing angle characteristics

(see column 7 lines 35-40, column 18 lines 3-8, column 19 lines 66-67, and column 20 lines 1-19, 60-65).

5. Claims 1-13 and 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiroshi Okumura (Pub. No.: US 2002/0191128).

As to claims 10-13, Okumura teaches the liquid crystal display device according to claim 1 (see above rejection). Okumura teaches a display mode of a liquid crystal panel is VA (Vertically Aligned) mode, CPA (Continuous Pinwheel Alignment) mode, MVA (Multi-Domain Vertically Aligned) mode, and RTN (Reverse twisted nematic) mode (see figure 3A). Note that CPA, MVA, and RTN are obvious modes because they are just types of vertically aligned modes.

As to claim 16, Okumura teaches the liquid crystal display device according to claim 15 (see above rejection). Okumura also teaches the drive voltage corresponding to the function to be performed is set in advance (see [0103] and [0174]). Note that it is obvious for these drive voltages to be set in advance because they are already defined as on and off.

As to claim 17, Okumura teaches the liquid crystal display device according to claim 15 (see above rejection). Okumura also teaches the drive voltage in accordance with a switching signal for switching between wide viewing angle characteristics and

narrow viewing angle characteristics (see [0103] and [0174]). Note that it is obvious that since the voltages can be switched that a switching signal would be used for switching between angle characteristics.

As to claim 18, Okumura teaches the liquid crystal display device according to claim 15 (see above rejection). Okumura also teaches under a circumstance where the drive voltage is set to a drive voltage for wide viewing angle characteristics, sets a drive voltage which is to be applied to an arbitrary part of the liquid crystal panel, so as to be a drive voltage for narrow viewing angle characteristics (see [0103] and [0174]). Note that it is obvious and well known in the art for a drive voltage to be applied to an arbitrary part of the liquid crystal panel.

As to claim 19, Okumura teaches the liquid crystal display device according to claim 15 (see above rejection). Okumura also teaches under a circumstance where the drive voltage is set to a drive voltage for narrow viewing angle characteristics, sets a drive voltage which is to be applied to an arbitrary part of the liquid crystal panel, so as to be a drive voltage for wide viewing angle characteristics (see [0103] and [0174]). Note that it is obvious and well known in the art for a drive voltage to be applied to an arbitrary part of the liquid crystal panel.

As to claims 20 and 21, Okumura teaches the liquid crystal display device according to claim 15 (see above rejection). Okumura also teaches the drive voltage

setting section, in performing the Internet access and electronic messaging (see [0004]), sets the drive voltage corresponding to narrow viewing angle characteristics (see [0103] and [0174]). The teaching of Internet access or electronic messaging is obvious from paragraph [0004] of Okumura (LCD devices have been extensively used for electronic equipment designed for portable communication).

As to claim 22, Okumura teaches the liquid crystal display device according to claim 15 (see above rejection). Okumura also teaches the drive voltage setting section, sets the drive voltage corresponding to wide viewing angle characteristics (see [0103] and [0174]). The teaching of camera shooting, Internet access or electronic messaging is obvious from paragraph [0004] of Okumura (LCD devices have been extensively used for electronic equipment designed for portable communication).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Patent No.: US 5,969,700 and US 7,400,367 and Publication No.: US 2003/0146893.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JENNIFER ZUBAJLO whose telephone number is (571)270-1551. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8 am - 5 pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amare Mengistu can be reached on (571) 272-7674. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jennifer Zubajlo/
11/7/08

/Amare Mengistu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629